



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,885	12/20/2005	Takayuki Kimoto	92478-8800	1110
53044 7590 04/17/2008 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P. (Matsushita) 600 ANTON BOULEVARD SUITE 1400 COSTA MESA, CA 92626				
EXAMINER				
PIZIALI, JEFFREY J				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/17/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/561,885

Applicant(s)

KIMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Jeff Piziali

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 December 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-85/86)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/20/05 & 5/22/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Inventor's Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: "*I*" (e.g., see Fig. 2A); "*10*" (e.g., see Figs. 9 & 10); "*20*" (e.g., see Figs. 9 & 10); "*S118*" (e.g., see Fig. 11); "*S121*" (e.g., see Fig. 12); and "*S123*" (e.g., see Fig. 12). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the figures.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
The phrase, "*update of the internal memory*" should be changed, for example to, "*updating of the internal memory*" (see page 15, line 26).

Appropriate correction is required.

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because:
The phrase, "*switch the output*" should be changed, for example to, "*switching the output*" (see page 40, line 7).

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

6. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*image signals*" (in line 1); "*image signals*" (in line 7); "*said image signals*" (in line 9); "*said converted image signals*" (in line 10); "*image signals*" (in line 13); and "*said image signals*" (in line 16). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each claimed "*image signals*" instance is meant to refer to a single, identical set of "*image signals*"; or rather whether each claimed "*image signals*" instance is supposed to refer to distinct and independent sets of "*image signals*". In many of the above instances, the lack of a grammatical article (such as "*a*" or "*a plurality of*" or "*the*" or "*said*") preceding the respective limitation renders it unclear whether the claim is establishing a new element; or instead referring back to some preestablished limitation.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*an image*" (in line 2); "*part of the image to be displayed in the first area*" (in line 7); "*display the part of the image in the first area*" (in line 9); "*a remaining part of the image to be displayed in the second area*" (in line 13); and "*the remaining part of the image to be displayed in the first area*" (in line 15). It would unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether

Art Unit: 2629

there is a single "*image*" extending across both the first and second areas; or rather whether there are two distinct and independent "*images*" respectively in the first and second areas.

Additionally, it would be unclear to an artisan what the "*the remaining part of the image*" remains from. Furthermore, it would be unclear whether the "*the remaining part of the image*" is meant to be displayed in the first or the second area.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*a color attribute*" (in line 8) and "*a color attribute*" (in line 16). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each claimed "*color attribute*" limitation is meant to refer to a single, identical "*color attribute*" element; or rather whether each claimed "*color attribute*" limitation is supposed to refer to distinct and independent "*color attribute*" elements.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*thereof*" (in line 17). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art what the subject of "*thereof*" is supposed to be.

10. Claim 1 recites the limitation "*said converted image signals*" (in line 10). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

11. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*therein*" (in line 3). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art what the subject of "*therein*" is supposed to be.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*image signals*" (in claim 2, line 1); "*image signals*" (in claim 1, line 1); "*image signals*" (in claim 1, line 7); "*said image signals*" (in claim 1, line 9); "*said converted image signals*" (in claim 1, line 10); "*image signals*" (in claim 1, line 13); and "*said image signals*" (in claim 1, line 16). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each claimed "*image signals*" instance is meant to refer to a single, identical set of "*image signals*"; or rather whether each claimed "*image signals*" instance is supposed to refer to distinct and independent sets of "*image signals*". In many of the above instances, the lack of a grammatical article (such as "*a*" or "*a plurality of*" or "*the*" or "*said*") preceding the respective limitation renders it unclear whether the claim is establishing a new element; or instead referring back to some preestablished limitation.

12. Claim 3 recites the limitation "*the display screen*" (in line 3). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

13. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*a reception timing*" (in line 7) and "*a reception timing*" (in line 1). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each claimed "*reception timing*" limitation is meant to refer to a single, identical "*reception timing*"; or rather whether each claimed "*reception timing*" limitation is supposed to refer to distinct and independent "*reception timings*".

14. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*the determined boundary position*" (in claim 4, line 4) and "*the boundary position*" (in claim 3, line 3). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each claimed "*boundary position*" limitation is meant to refer to a single, identical "*boundary position*"; or rather whether each claimed "*boundary position*" limitation is supposed to refer to distinct and independent "*boundary positions*".

15. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*a user input*" (in claim 5, line 2) and "*a user input*" (in claim 4, line 3). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each claimed "*user input*" limitation is meant to refer to

a single, identical "*user input*"; or rather whether each claimed "*user input*" limitation is supposed to refer to distinct and independent "*user inputs*".

16. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*a user input*" (in claim 6, line 2) and "*a user input*" (in claim 4, line 3). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each claimed "*user input*" limitation is meant to refer to a single, identical "*user input*"; or rather whether each claimed "*user input*" limitation is supposed to refer to distinct and independent "*user inputs*".

17. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*a user input*" (in claim 7, line 2) and "*a user input*" (in claim 4, line 3). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each claimed "*user input*" limitation is meant to refer to a single, identical "*user input*"; or rather whether each claimed "*user input*" limitation is supposed to refer to distinct and independent "*user inputs*".

18. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*modify content*" (in claim 8, line 2) and "*modifying content*" (in claim 8, line 4). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each claimed "*content*" limitation is meant to refer to a single, identical element of "*content*"; or rather whether each claimed "*content*" limitation is supposed to refer to distinct and independent "*content*" elements.

19. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*a user input*" (in claim 9, line 2) and "*a user input*" (in claim 8, line 3). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each claimed "*user input*" limitation is meant to refer to a single, identical "*user input*"; or rather whether each claimed "*user input*" limitation is supposed to refer to distinct and independent "*user inputs*".

20. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*a user input*" (in claim 10, line 2) and "*a user input*" (in claim 8, line 3). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each claimed "*user input*" limitation is meant to refer to a single, identical "*user input*"; or rather whether each claimed "*user input*" limitation is supposed to refer to distinct and independent "*user inputs*".

21. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*image signals*" (in line 1); "*image signals*" (in line 5); "*said image signals*" (in line 7); "*said converted image signals*" (in line 9); "*image signals*" (in line 10); and "*said image signals*" (in line 13). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each claimed "*image signals*" instance is meant to refer to a single, identical set of "*image signals*"; or rather whether each claimed "*image signals*" instance is supposed to refer to distinct and independent sets of "*image signals*". In many of the above instances, the lack of a grammatical article (such as "*a*" or "*a plurality of*" or "*the*" or "*said*") preceding the respective limitation renders it unclear whether the claim is establishing a new element; or instead referring back to some preestablished limitation.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: "*an image*" (in line 2); "*part of the image to be displayed in the first area*" (in line 6); "*displaying the part of the image in the first area*" (in line 8); "*a remaining part of the image to*

be displayed in the second area" (in line 11); and *"displaying the remaining part of the image in the second area"* (in line 15). It would unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether there is a single *"image"* extending across both the first and second areas; or rather whether there are two distinct and independent *"images"* respectively in the first and second areas. Additionally, it would be unclear to an artisan what the *"the remaining part of the image"* remains from.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: *"a color attribute"* (in line 7) and *"a color attribute"* (in line 14). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art whether each claimed *"color attribute"* limitation is meant to refer to a single, identical *"color attribute"* element; or rather whether each claimed *"color attribute"* limitation is supposed to refer to distinct and independent *"color attribute"* elements.

An omitted structural cooperative relationship results from the claimed subject matter: *"thereof"* (in line 14). It would be unclear to one having ordinary skill in the art what the subject of *"thereof"* is supposed to be.

22. Claim 11 recites the limitation *"said converted image signals"* (in line 9). There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The documents listed on the attached '*Notice of References Cited*' are cited to further evidence the state of the art pertaining to image display devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeff Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-7678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (6:30AM - 3PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin Shalwala can be reached on (571) 272-7681. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.